



Konate, S, Sirima, D, Ardjima, L, Sanou, Y, Hema, EM, Kabre, BG, Fa, John ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3611-8487>, Luiselli, L and Petrozzi, F (2020) Long-term changes in population size and the age-structure and sex-ratio of waterbuck in a Sudanian savannah of Burkina Faso. *African Journal of Ecology*, 59 (1). pp. 132-141. ISSN 0141-6707

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/626543/>

Version: Accepted Version

Publisher: Wiley

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/aje.12793>

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>

1 Running head: Waterbuck ecology in Burkina Faso

2

3 **Long-term changes in population size and the age-structure and sex-**
4 **ratio of Waterbuck in a Sudanian savannah of Burkina Faso**

5

6 Sidiki Konate^A, Djidama Sirima^A, Lankoande Ardjima^A, Youssouf Sanou^B, Emmanuel M.

7 Hema^{A,C,D}, B. Gustave Kabre^A, John E. Fa^{E,F}, Luca Luiselli^{D,G,H,*}, Fabio Petrozzi^I

8

9 ^ALaboratoire de Biologie et Écologie Animales, Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, 09 B.P. 848

10 Ouagadougou 09, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

11 ^BDirection de la Faune et de Ressources Cynégétiques, Ministère de l'Environnement, de

12 l'Economie Verte et du Changement climatique, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

13 ^C Université de Dédougou, UFR/Sciences Appliquées et Technologiques, Dédougou, Burkina Faso.

14 ^DInstitute for Development, Ecology, Conservation and Cooperation, via G. Tomasi di Lampedusa

15 33, 00144 Rome, Italy.

16 ^EDivision of Biology and Conservation Ecology, School of Science and the Environment,

17 Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M1 5GD, UK.

18 ^FCenter for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Jalan Cifor Rawajaha, Situ Gede, Bogor

19 Barat, Kota Bogor, Jawa Barat 16115, Indonesia.

20 ^GDepartment of Applied and Environmental Biology, Rivers State University of Science and

21 Technology, P.M.B. 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

22 ^HDépartement de Zoologie, Faculté des Sciences, Université de Lomé, B.P. 6057 Lomé, Togo.

23 ^IEcolobby, via E. Jenner 70, 00151 Rome, Italy.

24 *Corresponding author. Email: l.luiselli@ideccngo.org

25

26 E-mails: konate.sidiki@yahoo.fr (Sidiki Konaté); hema.emmanuel@yahoo.fr (Emmanuel Hema);

27 lacphas@yahoo.com (Lankoande Ardjima); sanouyoussouf@yahoo.fr (Youssouf Sanou);

28 sirima_djidama@yahoo.fr (Djidama Sirima); gkabre2@gmail.com (Gustave Kabre);

29 l.luiselli@ideccngo.org (Luca Luiselli); jfa949@gmail.com (John E. Fa); fapetrozzi@gmail.com (Fabio

30 Petrozzi)

31

Abstract The waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus*), though widespread throughout Africa, is suspected to be declining overall. Data on population numbers and structure are lacking for many parts of its range, especially in West Africa, where the subspecies *defassa* is found. The aim of the present study was to evaluate the abundance, distribution and attributes of waterbuck populations in the Nazinga Forest Reserve, southern Burkina Faso. We investigated waterbuck population trends in the park using transect data collected in 1985-2019. For the more detailed analyses of population structure and distribution of the animals we used census data gathered during 2019. Most animals were adults (46.6%), and the sex ratio was heavily skewed towards females (5:1). Most animals were concentrated along the larger rivers. There was no influence of poacher activity on waterbuck distribution. In the long term (1985-2019), the population dynamics of waterbuck can be roughly divided into two main periods: a phase of population increase from 1985 to 2005, and one of ongoing population collapse from 2007-2019. Although the declining population trend was obvious, coefficients of determination were low indicating that the years explained poorly the number of individuals and the number of sightings obtained. Waterbuck numbers in the Nazinga Forest Reserve are declining, but we found no single reason to explain this trend. It is likely that a combination of factors, including global warming (increased aridity) and illegal activities such as poaching, are responsible. Because there are probably multiple reasons for the observed waterbuck population decline in our study area, we suggest that a multifaceted approach should be adopted in order to enhance the conservation status of the local waterbuck populations.

Keywords *Kobus ellipsiprymnus defassa*; Bovidae; abundance; density; group size; sex ratio; age structure; ecology; West Africa

54 **Introduction**

55 The waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus*) remains widespread across western, central, eastern and southern
 56 Africa, and occupies a range of habitats such as grassy savannah plains, and open woodland near permanent
 57 waterbodies (Nowak 1991). Waterbuck are also an important game species (e.g., Berry 1975; Cloete *et al.*
 58 2007) but they are often poached. According to the IUCN Red List (IUCN 2020), the abundance of the
 59 species is suspected to be declining, but there is no evidence to confirm that the rate of decline meets the
 60 requirements for Near Threatened or Vulnerable status.

61 Although a number of studies on the ecology of the species has been published (e.g., Spinage 1968,
 62 1969; Melton 1978, 1983; Tomlinson 1978; Kassa *et al.* 2008), reliable population estimates are scarce. This
 63 is especially true for waterbuck populations in the Sudanian savannahs of West Africa (subspecies *defassa*;
 64 Lorenzen *et al.* 2006), where the species is perceived to be declining (Chardonnet and Chardonnet 2004).
 65 Although some preliminary surveys have been undertaken on the population status of the species in
 66 Zakouma, Chad (Mackie 2004), Pendjari, Benin (Rouamba and Hi 2004), Gashaka Gumti, Nigeria (Nicholas
 67 2004), and in Gambia (Jallow *et al.* 2004), few quantitative studies are currently available (i.e. in Benin:
 68 Kassa *et al.* 2008; Djagoun *et al.* 2013), and little is known of the population dynamics of any West African
 69 waterbuck population.

70 In Burkina Faso, where the waterbuck is found primarily in protected areas in the South of the
 71 country, some estimates data for the species (alongside other ungulates) are available for the gallery forests
 72 of the Comoé-Léraba region (Hema *et al.* 2017a) and the Nazinga region (Hema *et al.* 2018). In this study,
 73 we report abundance, density, group size, sex and age structure of waterbuck populations in the Nazinga
 74 Forest Reserve (FC/RGN). More specifically, we answer to the following key questions:

75 (1) Is the population structure of Burkina Faso waterbuck consistent with that studied elsewhere in
 76 Africa in terms of sex-ratio and age structure?

77 (2) Are the yearly density estimates of Burkina Faso waterbuck comparable with those observed in
 78 East Africa or, as expected on the basis of the widespread threatened status of West African ungulates, are
 79 they lower than in other regions of the continent?

80 (3) Is there any long-term consistent yearly trend (increasing, decreasing, stable) of waterbuck
 81 population in Burkina Faso?

82 Our results will serve to highlight the conservation needs of the species in West Africa, in the light of
 83 the extreme challenges that ungulates are currently facing in the West African savannahs due to extensive
 84 habitat loss and poaching (e.g. see Bouché *et al.* 2016).

85

86 **Methods**

87 *Study area*

88 The field study was carried out in the FC/RGN, a protected area, 97436 ha surface, in south-central
 89 Burkina Faso (West Africa) (Figure 1). The vegetation of the study area is Sudanian-type woody savannah
 90 vegetation dominated by *Detarium microcarpum*, *Burkea africana*, *Azvelia africana*, *Isobertinia doka*,
 91 *Pteleopsis suberosa*, *Acacia dudgeoni*, *Gardenia* spp., *Vitellaria paradoxa*, *Terminalia* spp. and *Combretum*
 92 spp. The dominant perennial herbaceous plants are *Andropogon asciodis* and *Schizachyrium sanguineum*.
 93 The woody species of the alluvial valleys are *Anogeissus leiocarpus*, *Daniellia oliveri* and *Mitragyna*
 94 *inermis*, associated with *Andropogon gayanus* and *Vetiveria nigriflora* as perennial herbaceous dominant of
 95 this type of environment (Dekker 1985; Yameogo 1999). Along the water bodies, relatively closed, "wet"
 96 habitats made up of gallery forests can be seen; this formation is dominated by large woody species such as
 97 *Anogeissus leiocarpus*, *Khaya senegalensis*, *Diospiros mespiliformis* and *Piliostigma thonningii*, and for the
 98 herbaceous layer by grasses such as *Andropogon gayanus* and *Pennisetum angustum*. Annual rainfall in the
 99 region of FC/RGN is about 1,500 mm.

100 In the study area there still exist large populations of ungulates (*Tragelaphus scriptus*, *Sylvicapra*
 101 *grymmia*, *Alcelaphus buselaphus*, *Hippotragus equines*, *Phacochoerus africanus*; cf. Hema et al., 2018) and
 102 *Loxodonta africana* (Hema et al., 2016), with *Crocuta crocuta* being the largest predator (Hema et al., 2019).
 103 Illegal poaching is present, especially in the boundary strips of the park (Hema et al., 2017c).

104

105 *Data collection*

106 Large mammal censuses in FC/RGN have been undertaken in the park since 1981 along 30
 107 equidistant 1.4 km transects (Figure 1), during the months of February to early April. In 2019, we performed

all transects during 19-25 March. Data collection protocols were first set up in 1981 (as occasional and somewhat unstandardized surveys) and revised by O'Donoghue (1985) after which standardized line transects were to be walked each year to obtain comparable estimates of the local abundance of animals. Sexes of adults were distinguished based on the presence/absence of horns (present in males). We defined juveniles those individuals that were less than 8 months old, subadults those between 8 months and 1.5 years old for females and between 8 months and 2 years old for males. We used relative size and the appearance of the horns in males to determine the relative age of the observed animals.

All transects were oriented in a South-North direction throughout the entire park. The entrance and exit to each transect was signposted using a numbered metal disc fixed on a tree at eye level. During each annual census, the same 79 transects (691.811 km) in the seven FC/RGN zones were covered during the dry season. The methodology employed was always identical: after a training session, transects were walked by 12 teams of three people each; each team consisting of a team leader and two observers (i.e. a villager and a tracker). We applied unlimited bandwidth linear transects (Burnham et al., 1980, Buckland et al., 1993, 2001).

During each annual census, teams walked along the centre of a transect, equipped with binoculars, GPS, compasses, rangefinders, maps, and cards on which to note the species, number of individual animals observed, their sex and age, as well as radial distance, viewing angle, activity and signs of illegal human activities (bullets, tree cutting, human racks, motor-bike tracks, tree-branch thinning and pastoralism tracks). Animal observations were georeferenced using a Garmin 64S GPS, and compasses were used to measure angle with range finders to determine radial distances. All surveys started at 6am, immediately after which visibility conditions allowed the surveyors to clearly see the animals, even at a distance.

129

130 *Data analysis*

In this study, we investigated waterbuck population trends in FC/RGN using transect data for the period 1985-2019. Data for 1985-2007 has already been published (Hema *et al.* 2018) and previous census results (1981-1985) were not used because a different field method was employed during this period (O'Donoghue, 1985). For the more detailed analyses of population structure (age and sex-ratio) and distribution of the

135 animals in the park we used census data gathered in 2019 as the same type of data was not collected in the
 136 previous years.

137 QGIS 2.18.10 was used to map sighting records and for determining waterbuck concentration zones.
 138 QGIS was also employed to measure distances between the different waterbuck groups, and distances of
 139 waterbuck groups from the nearest waterbody, from paths/tracks and from signs of illegal human activity.
 140 We used the standardized Morisita dispersion index (I_p) (Zar 1999) to measure spatial dispersion. I_p ranges
 141 from -1.0 to +1.0. The random dispersion modes (Poisson distribution) give an I_p equal to zero, while
 142 uniform distribution modes have an I_p less than zero. Grouped distribution modes have an I_p greater than
 143 zero.

144 On the basis of the number of contacts and the number of waterbuck individuals, we calculated the
 145 proportion of sex and age classes in the population for 2019, as well as the density (measured as the
 146 Kilometric Index of Abundance, KIA, and as the Kilometric Index of Contacts, KIC) (Maillard *et al.* 2001).
 147 In KIC, we considered all independent sighting events; so, for instance, if we observed 5 individuals in a
 148 group and one solitary individual apart, the count was 6 for KIA but just 2 for KIC.

149
$$KIA = (\text{number of individuals} / \text{numbers of kilometers covered}).$$

150
$$KIC = (\text{number of observations} / \text{numbers of kilometers covered}).$$

151 In these formulas, the number of kilometers covered represents the sum of the total distance of the transects.

152 We calculated the total number of encountered individuals among transects from 1985-2019, but
 153 with some years in which these numbers were not available due to the lack of field surveys. We estimated
 154 waterbuck density with the Distance Sampling method (Buckland *et al.* 1993, Thomas *et al.* 2002), using the
 155 DISTANCE software, version 7.2. This method makes it possible to estimate the population density by
 156 calculating the probabilities of detection of animals as a function of their distance to the transect. The general
 157 formula for estimating the density of waterbuck groups is as follows (Burnham *et al.* 1980):

158
$$\hat{D} = \frac{n\hat{f}(0)}{2L}$$

159 where \hat{D} is the density estimator; n is the sample size (number of observations) of observations; L the total
 160 length of the transects; $\hat{f}(0)$ the estimator of the effective half-width of the band is the detection probability
 161 function estimated by the software through robust mathematical models related to the probability density
 162 function.

163 The following estimators, that are considered as the most robust (Buckland *et al.* 1993), were
 164 analysed: the cosine and polynomial-tuned uniform function, the cosine and Hermite polynomial-adjusted
 165 semi normal function, and the cosine and simple polynomial-adjusted chance rate function. The choice of the
 166 model was made according to the following criteria:

- 167 (i) the value of the effective strip width was close to the calculated mean perpendicular distance and the
 168 value obtained with the threshold method;
- 169 (ii) the expected group size (calculated by DISTANCE software) was closest to the mean group size
 170 (calculated on Excel);
- 171 (iii) the Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) value was the lowest one, and the visual observation of the
 172 curve of the detection function was good;
- 173 (iv) χ^2 value was not significant.

174 Two types of densities were estimated: the density of groups (DS) estimates the number of contacts
 175 with animal groups per unit area (in our case per km²); the density of individuals (D) estimates the number of
 176 single animals per unit area (also per km²).

177 To evaluate age structure of the waterbuck population we distinguished three age classes: adults,
 178 sub-adults, and juveniles.

179 We used observed-versus-expected χ^2 test to check whether adult sex-ratio was even or not, and
 180 Pearson's χ^2 to test for differences in the frequency of waterbuck sightings among zones of the protected
 181 area. Correlations between (Box-Cox transformed) number of observed individuals and (i) (Box-Cox
 182 transformed) distances to illegal activities, (ii) (Box-Cox transformed) distances to the nearest path/track
 183 used by people, and (iii) (Box-Cox transformed) distances to the nearest water point, were carried out by

184 Pearson's correlation coefficient. Correlation between estimated yearly KIA and the (arcsine) percentage of
 185 females in the sample size was performed using a Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient.

186 Box-Cox transformation (Box and Cox 1964) was used to normalize variables whose data were not
 187 Gaussian (i.e. number of waterbuck individuals, distance separating the waterbuck groups to the illegal
 188 activities and to the nearest water points). The statistical software SPSS Statistics 21 and Past 3.0 were used
 189 to perform all analyses.

190

191 **Results**

192 *Population structure by sex and by age (year 2019)*

193 A total of 25 visual contacts of waterbucks were recorded during our 2019 census, with a total number of
 194 103 observed individuals. Of the 25 visual contacts, in 13 cases the animals were fleeing or on alert, while in
 195 the rest of cases they were either resting or walking or grazing. Adults represented 46.6% of the observed
 196 population (n = 103), sub-adults were 6.8%, juveniles were 17.5% and undetermined individuals were
 197 29.1%. Sex ratio was heavily skewed towards females (5:1; observed-versus-expected $\chi^2 = 24$, df = 1, P <
 198 0.0001). The size of the great majority of the groups ranged 2-6 (Figure S1).

199

200 *DISTANCE-generated estimates of population parameters (year 2019)*

201 The probability of detecting waterbucks according to the Hazard rate/Cosine model (Figure S2) showed that
 202 there was a small number of observations between 0m and 30m compared to observations made between
 203 31m and 49m. The summarized results on the estimates of parameters of the waterbuck population by the
 204 Hazard rate/Cosine model are given in Table 1. The population estimate showed wide confidence limits
 205 (Table 1) and there was large variation in the sizes of the various groups observed (up to 18 individuals;
 206 Figure S1). The fit between the observations and the visibility curve was also not good (Figure S2). The
 207 calculated population size in FC/RGN for 2019 was 502 animals (see Table 1 for the confidence intervals of
 208 the estimate).

209

210

211

212 *Density and spatial patterns of occurrence (year 2019)*

213 Waterbuck sightings in FC/RGN were concentrated along the principal rivers: 96% of the species' sightings
 214 were within 1.8km of the water, mainly around the artificial perennial waterbodies built along some streams
 215 for elephants (Figure 2). Most observations occurred in the core conservation area (density of individuals
 216 was 0.39 per km²), but very few were in the hunting area (density = 0.05 individuals per km²). These two
 217 sectors differed significantly in terms of waterbuck density: Pearson's $\chi^2=31$, df = 1, $P < 0.001$. We obtained
 218 a KIC = 0.036 and a KIA = 0.149. The dispersion analysis also revealed that waterbuck groups were
 219 spatially aggregated (Morisita $I_p = 0.568$; $\chi^2 = 902.3$, df = 78, $P < 0.0001$).

220 Regarding illegal activities, a total of 146 signs could be counted along the transects during our 2019
 221 surveys (Table S1). These activities were observed throughout FC/RGN but were statistically concentrated
 222 (dispersion index of Morisita: $I_p = 0.521$) in its eastern side where waterbucks were not observed (Figure
 223 S3). The distance from the nearest sign of poacher activity did not influence the number of observed
 224 individuals ($r = 0.04$, $n = 25$, $P = 0.842$), and the same was true for the distance from the nearest water-body
 225 ($r = -0.21$, $n = 25$, $P = 0.324$) as well as for the distance from the nearest path/track ($r = 0.191$, $n = 25$, $P =$
 226 0.360).

227

228 *Yearly population trends: 1985-2019*

229 During the period 1985-2019, the population dynamics of the studied waterbuck population can be roughly
 230 divided into two main periods (Figure 3): 1) a population increase between 1985 and 2005 (Spearman's rank
 231 correlation coefficient: $r_s = 0.692$, $P < 0.05$), and 2) an ongoing population collapse from 2007-2019 ($r_s = -$
 232 0.715 , $P < 0.01$). There was also an annual slightly, non-significant, negative trend ($r_s = -0.520$, $P = 0.123$)
 233 in the number of individual waterbucks observed during the period 2008 to 2019 (Figure 3). However, in this
 234 latter phase, the coefficients of determination (R^2) were low (respectively, 0.1366 (number of individuals)
 235 and 0.1803 (contact numbers)), thus indicating that the years explained poorly the number of individuals and
 236 the number of contacts obtained. In general, both the number of contacts and the number of individuals
 237 showed a sharp decline from 2010 to 2014 followed by a slight increase from 2014 to 2016.

The interannual observed sex-ratio was not affected by the density estimates: indeed, there was no correlation between estimated yearly KIA and the (arcsine) percentage of females in the sample size ($r = 0.086$, $P = 0.893$).

Discussion

Population structure by sex and by age

In FC/RGN, waterbuck groups are typically mixed families of adult females and juveniles, with females being largely dominant over males (5 to 1). Such a skewed sex-ratio was very different from that reported in the literature: for instance, in Uganda the male: female sex-ratio was 1: 1.6 (Spinage 1970), and in Ethiopia 1: 1.72 (Tsegaye *et al.* 2015). However, within a national park in Tanzania the sex ratio was 3: 1 in favour of females and 2: 1 outside the same national park in favour of females (Caro 1999). Thus, it seems that the adult sex-ratio is very variable in the species, with poor predictability on the basis of habitat characteristics, exposure to exploitation or resources available, but almost invariably with a higher number of adult females compared to the adult males. In ungulates, males are killed disproportionately to their abundance compared to adult females with local predation directly affecting patterns of sex ratio variation among adults (Berger and Gomper 1999). Since differences in survival of sexes may arise as a direct consequence of greater age-specific mortality among males, with selection operating differently on males and females (Berger and Gomper 1999), we suggest that the same should be possibly the case at our study area with predation-risks (especially by hyaenas and crocodiles) being much higher in males than in females. There are no available data on whether waterbuck males are indeed more preyed upon compared to females in FC/RGN. It is also possible, however, that the strong sex ratio deviation could be due to a higher incidence of illegal hunting on males or to behavioural differences between females and adult males causing less detectability in the latter. Although there are insufficient data to test any of these hypotheses, it is clear that the long-term changes in age structure and sex-ratio of the studied waterbuck populations played a minor role in the decline of numbers. Given this, the effects of hunting and changes in the animals' behavior should be more adequately assessed with ad-hoc studies.

Data on age structure of waterbuck populations in different parts of Africa are still limited. However, our data were comparable to other populations: in Ethiopia, for instance, adults accounted for 55.65%,

subadults for 23.5% and juveniles for 21.06% (Tsegaye *et al.* 2015). However, if we exclude indeterminates (29%) from our study, the proportions of age classes are: adults 65%, sub-adults 10%, juveniles 25%, scarcely comparable to that of Ethiopia (Tsegaye *et al.* 2015). The ratio of adults/ juveniles averaged 2.66 in FC/RGN, which was very similar to that observed in (= 2.52) South Africa's Kruger National Park (Owen-Smith and Mason 2005). Thus, neither the sex ratio nor the age structure is comparable to that from other studies, and, in general, transect surveys can be suboptimal in determining the actual sex-ratios and age structure of savannah ungulates (Hema *et al.*, 2020). In ungulate populations, age structure is an important determinant of adult survival as the mean survival is associated with age of adults (Festa-Bianchet *et al.* 2003). More studies are needed to understand annual variations in age structure and their implications for survival.

Density and associated parameters

Our study revealed that (i) waterbuck density varied significantly among the different FC/RGN zones (ranging from 0.05 individuals per km² up to = 0.39 individuals per km²), and that (ii) the various groups showed clumped spatial pattern of distribution. The various groups observed tended to be non-randomly distributed within the FC/RGN area but showed “spatial contagion” effect between each other. When we tried to identify the main factor explaining this “aggregated pattern”, we rejected any linear relationship with both anthropic negative factors (distance from paths/tracks and distance from sites with sign of illegal activities) as well as environmental positive factors (distance from waterbodies). However, our survey was undertaken during the dry season when water is clearly a limited resource, and since these ungulates are highly water-dependent species (e.g. Melton 1978), there was obviously a greater chance that they are grouped around the permanent water points (Hien *et al.* 2007). This would explain the strong aggregative distributions of their groups around permanent water points without any linear relationship with the distance from the waterbody itself.

We estimated an average density of 0.25 individuals \times km² and a mean group density of 0.21 \times km². Although the individual density observed at FC/RGN was much lower than the highest observed so far in Africa (at Lake Nakuru in Kenya, with over 10 individuals \times km²; Kutilek 1974), it was still higher than in most areas: indeed, the mean density is 0.05-0.15 \times km² in areas where the species is reasonably common

and $0.2\text{-}0.9 \times \text{km}^2$, more frequently $0.4\text{-}1.5 \times \text{km}^2$ in remote areas that are presumably in good habitat status (Furstenburg 2005). Thus, our data suggest that waterbuck population abundance is still high in FC/RGN despite the observed declining population trend. Waterbuck density at Lake Nakuru, as a comparison, was likely to have been artificially high to be stable, and we suggest that this extraordinary concentration of animals was perhaps unusual due to abnormally favourable ecological conditions (high food resource availability in an exceptional year, migrations, or something equivalent) that do not occur in the other above-mentioned areas. In fact, high densities of *K. ellipsiprymnus* populations have been observed during very favourable years. For example, in FC/RGN, in 2010 there was a density four-fold higher than in 2014 (Fig. 3), so annual variability should be mentioned as an important factor when making comparisons between populations, and an important factor to be considered in further studies of the demography of this species. Since the data were not analysed with the same statistical methodology in the various areas of Africa studied so far, the density estimates reported in the various studies may not be totally comparable. DISTANCE methodology also requires about 60 contacts to obtain unbiased density estimates (Buckland *et al.* 1993, 2001) whereas our study achieved an insufficient number of contacts ($n = 25$) for obtaining a robust estimate. Thus, the density values reported in this paper should be considered merely as preliminary. Similarly, previous estimates of waterbuck densities using DISTANCE methodology in West Africa were also biased by too small sample sizes: for instance, Brugière *et al.* (2005) in Guinea and also Cornelis (2002) in our same study area. Group density at FC/RGN was consistent with published studies (range $0.27\text{-}0.96 \times \text{km}^2$; see Brugière *et al.* 2005).

On the basis of the KIA estimates (that is least prone to statistical biases than DISTANCE but obviously more empirical), our data ($\text{KIA} = 0.149$) suggest a much higher abundance in the FC/RGN savannah than in the gallery forests of south-west Burkina Faso (Comoè-Léraba National Park: $\text{KIA} = 0.022$; Hema *et al.*, 2017a). In the latter, available habitat is differently shaped as it basically exists along the banks of the river Comoé (Hema *et al.* 2017a).

Yearly population trends: 1985-2019

Our study revealed that in FC/RGN, Waterbucks had a phase of population growth between 1985 and 2005 and then a significant decrease between 2007-2019. However, for the declining phase, the determination

322 coefficient and sample size (10 years) are low and the strength of the negative tendency cannot be totally
 323 reliable. We consider that the low value of the coefficient of determination is due to the low slope in the
 324 straight line after 2008, so that a relatively small population decline cannot be explained as having such large
 325 variations between years. In other words, a leap up from a new year can make the negative trend disappear.
 326 Hema et al. (2018) analysed the fluctuations in population size of waterbucks in FC/RGN during 1985-2008
 327 and found that these fluctuations were stronger than for other sympatric ungulates. It should be taken into
 328 account that, concerning the period 2009-2019, the population estimates showed wide confidence limits
 329 because the number of contacts was relatively low and there was large variation in the sizes of the various
 330 groups observed, thus reducing the estimate performances of the DISTANCE method. The low number of
 331 contacts also produced the suboptimal fit between the observations and the visibility curve as estimated by
 332 DISTANCE.

333 Why then did the population trend become constantly negative after 2005 and with a clear collapse after
 334 2007? Previous studies uncovered a significantly positive correlation between rainfall and population size of
 335 *Kobus ellipsiprymnus* (Ogutu et al. 2008; Bouché et al. 2016), and at FC/RGN it was demonstrated that the
 336 probability of high population sizes of this species increased with an increase of precipitation in August
 337 (Hema et al. 2018). Therefore, it can be hypothesized that the increasing aridity due to global warming that is
 338 affecting the Sahel region may be an important cause of the decreasing trend of the waterbuck population at
 339 the study area. Other reasons, for instance the changes in the management schemes adopted by the
 340 authorities (responsible for considerable population fluctuations in the warthog *Phacochoerus africanus*; see
 341 Hema et al. 2017b), are least likely to be involved in this declining trend. These management strategies
 342 implemented by the FC/RGN managers involved the strengthening of the FC/RGN surveillance teams, the
 343 development of reservoirs and salt water basins, and the permanent monitoring of the fire system. Indeed,
 344 waterbuck population fluctuations did not mirror the changes in management type observed in warthogs
 345 (Hema et al. 2017b). Illegal exploitation by poachers may also be an additional reason for the declining trend
 346 of the local waterbuck population (Hema et al. 2017c). Indeed, other two ungulate species are declining at
 347 FC/RGN (*Ourebia ourebi* and *Sylvicapra grimmia*), and their decline has been attributed to overhunting
 348 because these species were highly valued in the illegal bushmeat trade (Hema et al. 2017c). In addition, in
 349 another protected area of southern Burkina Faso (Comoé-Léraba), Hema et al. (2017a) uncovered a negative

correlation between hunting intensity and KIA estimates for waterbucks as well as for *Kobus kob*, *Ourebia*
ourebi and *Cephalophus rufilatus*. Nonetheless, there was no direct evidence that poaching was a main
 reason for the continued decline of the species in our study area. Overall, it is likely that a combination of
 factors may explain the negative population trends of waterbucks in FC/RGN. Factors, including global
 warming (by increasing aridity) in combination with illegal activities such as poaching, may be responsible.
 We suggest that a multifaceted approach should be adopted in order to enhance the conservation status of the
 local waterbuck populations.

Acknowledgements. We thank the Nazinga Game Ranch authorities and the Office National des Aires
 Protégées (OFINAP, Ouagadougou) for supporting the field surveys and releasing permission to work inside
 the protected area. Carlos Nores and four anonymous referees remarkably improved the submitted draft.

Data availability statement. The authors declare that their data will be provided in case of request by
 interested readers

Conflict of interest. The authors declare no conflicts of interest

References

- Berger J, Gompper ME (1999) Sex ratios in extant ungulates: products of contemporary predation or past life
 histories? *Journal of Mammalogy* 80: 1084-1113.
- Berry MPS (1975) Game ranching in Natal. *South African Journal of Wildlife Research* 5: 33-37.
- Box GEP, Cox DR (1964) An analysis of transformations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*
 26: 211-252.
- Bouché P, Lejeune P, Bailly V, Muyle M, Zinque MH, Mercier A, Cornélis D, Lungren C, Portier B, Marchal
 A, Renault F (2016) Conserving wildlife amongst the cotton fields. A third of a century of experience
 at the Nazinga Game Ranch, Burkina Faso. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 188: 437-450.

- 376 Brugière D, Dia M, Diakité S, Gbansara M, Mamy M, Saliou B, Magassouba B (2005) Large-and medium-
377 sized ungulates in the Haut Niger National Park, Republic of Guinea: population changes 1997–2002.
378 *Oryx* 39: 50-55.
- 379 Buckland ST, Anderson DR, Burnham KP, Laake JL (1993) Distance sampling: Estimating Abundance of
380 Biological Populations. Chapman and Hall, London and New York.
- 381 Buckland ST, Anderson DR, Burnham KP, Laake JL, Borchers DL, Thomas L (2001) Introduction to Distance
382 Sampling. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K
- 383 Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Laake JL (1980) Estimation of density from line transect sampling of biological
384 populations. *Wildlife Monographs* 72: 1-201.
- 385 Caro TM (1999) Demography and behaviour of African mammals subject to exploitation. *Biological*
386 *Conservation* 91: 91-97.
- 387 Chardonnet B, Chardonnet P (2004) Antelope Survey Update. IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist Group Report,
388 IUCN, Gland.
- 389 Cloete PC, Taljaard PR, Grove B (2007) A comparative economic case study of switching from cattle farming
390 to game ranching in the Northern Cape Province. *African Journal of Wildlife Research* 37: 71-79.
- 391 Cornelis D (2002) Analyse du monitoring écologique et cynégétique des populations des principaux ongulés
392 au ranch à gibier de Nazinga (Burkina Faso). Rapport non publié, Faculté Universitaire des Sciences
393 de Gembloux, Gembloux, Belgique.
- 394 Dekker AJFM (1985) Carte des unités de végétation de la région de Nazinga, Burkina Faso. FAO, BKF/82/008,
395 Ouagadougou.
- 396 Djaoun CAMS, Codron D, Sealy J, Mensah GA, Sinsin B (2013) Stable carbon isotope analysis of the diets
397 of West African bovids in Pendjari Biosphere Reserve, Northern Benin. *African Journal of Wildlife*
398 *Research* 43: 33-44.
- 399 Festa-Bianchet M, Gaillard J.-M, Côté SD (2003) Variable age structure and apparent density dependence in
400 survival of adult ungulates. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 72: 640-649.

- 401 Furstenburg D (2005) Waterbuck *Kobus ellipsiprymnus* (Ogilby, 1833). Geo Wild Consult, Cape Town.
- 402 Hema EM, Barnes RFW, Guenda W. (2006) Distribution of savannah elephants (*Loxodonta africana africana*
 403 Blumenbach 1797) within Nazinga Game Ranch, southern Burkina Faso. African Journal of Ecology
 404 49: 141-149. Hema EM, Dialla T, Sirima D, Ouattara Y, Tou I, Luiselli L (2019) Preliminary data on
 405 density and habitat of carnivores in two protected areas of Burkina Faso (West Africa). Mammalia
 406 <https://doi.org/10.1515/mammalia-2019-0026>.
- 407 Hema EM, Douamba B, Di Vittorio M, Dendi D, Guenda W, Petrozzi F, Ouédraogo B, Luiselli L. (2017b)
 408 Long-term (1985-2012) population fluctuations of warthog (*Phacochoerus africanus*) in Nazinga
 409 Game Ranch (Burkina Faso). African Journal of Ecology 55: 748-753.
- 410 Hema EM, Ouattara Y, Karama M, Petrozzi F, Di Vittorio M, Guenda W, Luiselli L (2017a) Population
 411 dynamics of medium and large mammals in a West African gallery forest area and the potential effects
 412 of poaching. Journal of Threatened Taxa 9: 10151-10157.
- 413 Hema EM, Ouattara Y, Parfait G, Di Vittorio M, Sirima D, Dendi D, Guenda W, Petrozzi F, Luiselli L (2017c)
 414 Bushmeat consumption in the West African Sahel of Burkina Faso, and the decline of some consumed
 415 species. Oryx 53: 145-150.
- 416 Hema EM, Ouattara Y, Tou MAI, Amori G, Karama M, Luiselli L (2020) Line-transect data may not produce
 417 reliable estimates of interannual sex-ratio and age structure variation in West African savannah
 418 ungulates. Tropical Zoology 33: 14-22.
- 419 Hema EM, Ouedraogo B, Belemsogbo U, Di Vittorio M, Dendi D, Guenda W, Luiselli L (2018) Effects of
 420 competitor density and rainfall regime on the long-term population dynamics of an herbivore
 421 community in a western African savannah. Revue d'Ecologie (Terre et Vie) 73: 492-503.
- 422 Hien B, Jenks JA, Klaver RW, Wicks III ZW (2007) Determinants of elephant distribution at Nazinga Game
 423 Ranch, Burkina Faso. Pachyderm 42: 70-80.
- 424 IUCN (2020) The IUCN's Red List of Threatened Species. Available at: www.iucnredlist.org (last accessed:
 425 03 May 2020).

- 426 Jallow AO, Touray O, Jallow M (2004) An update of the status of antelopes in the Gambia. In: Chardonnet,
427 B., Chardonnet, P. (editors), pp. 18-20, Antelope Survey Update. IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist
428 Group Report, IUCN, Gland.
- 429 Kassa B, Libois R, Sinsin B (2008) Diet and food preference of the waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus defassa*)
430 in the Pendjari National Park, Benin. African Journal of Ecology 46: 303-310.
- 431 Kutilek MJ (1974) The density and biomass of large mammals in Lake Nakuru National Park. African Journal
432 of Ecology 12: 201-212.
- 433 Lorenzen ED, Simonsen BT, Kat PW, Arctander P, Siegismund HR (2006) Hybridization between subspecies
434 of waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus*) in zones of overlap with limited introgression. Molecular
435 Ecology 15: 3787-3799.
- 436 Mackie C (2004) Aerial census of large mammals in Zakouma National Park, Chad. In: Chardonnet, B.,
437 Chardonnet, P. (editors), pp. 64-65, Antelope Survey Update. IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist Group
438 Report, IUCN, Gland.
- 439 Maillard D, Calenge C, Jacobs T, Gaillard JM, Merlot L (2001) The Kilometric Index as a monitoring tool for
440 populations of large terrestrial animals: a feasibility test at Zakouma National Park, Chad. African
441 Journal of Ecology 39: 306–309.
- 442 Melton DA (1978) Ecology of waterbuck in the Umfolozi Game Reserve. D.Sc. thesis, University of Pretoria.
- 443 Melton DA (1983) Population dynamics of waterbuck in the Umfolozi Game Reserve. African Journal of
444 Ecology 21: 77-91.
- 445 Nicholas A (2004) An update of the status of important large mammal species in Gashaka Gumti National
446 Park, Nigeria. In: Chardonnet, B., Chardonnet, P. (editors), pp. 40-42, Antelope Survey Update.
447 IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist Group Report, IUCN, Gland.
- 448 Nowak R (1991) Walker's Mammals of the World 5th edn. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- 449 O'donoghue M (1985) Ground census of large mammals at the Nazinga game ranch Project. Nazinga special
450 reports, Séries C (9). Nazinga project, ADEFA, Ouagadougou.

- 451 Ogutu JO, Piepho HP, Dublin HT, Bhola N, Reid RS (2008) Rainfall influences on ungulate population
452 abundance in the Mara Serengeti ecosystem. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 77: 814-829.
- 453 Owen-Smith N, Mason DR (2005) Comparative changes in adult vs. juvenile survival affecting population
454 trends of African ungulates. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 74: 762-773.
- 455 Rouamba P, Hien B (2004) Aerial census of wildlife in Pendjari Biosphere Reserve, Benin. In: Chardonnet,
456 B., Chardonnet, P. (editors), pp. 26-30, Antelope Survey Update. IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist
457 Group Report, IUCN, Gland.
- 458 Spinage CA (1968) The life of the waterbuck. *Animals* 11: 257-261.
- 459 Spinage CA (1969) Territoriality and social organization of the Uganda defassa waterbuck. *Journal of Zoology*
460 London 159: 329-361.
- 461 Spinage CA (1970) Population dynamics of the Uganda defassa waterbuck (*Kobus defassa ugandae*
462 Newmann) in the Queen Elizabeth Park, Uganda. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 39: 51-78.
- 463 Thomas L, Buckland ST, Rexstad EA, Laake JL, Strindberg S, Hedley SL, Bishop JRB, Marques TA, Burnham
464 KP (2010) Distance software: design and analysis of distance sampling surveys for estimating
465 population size. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 47: 5-14.
- 466 Tomlinson DNS (1978) The daily activity and behaviour patterns of waterbuck in relation to its seasonal
467 utilization of feeding habitats in the Lake McIlwaine Game Enclosure. M.Sc. thesis, University of
468 Rhodesia.
- 469 Tsegaye A, Bekele A, Balakrishnan M (2015). Population status, distribution and habitat association of
470 waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus ellipsiprymnus*) in Khebera Churchura National Park, southwestern
471 Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Biological Sciences* 14: 31-43.
- 472 Yameogo UG (1999) Contribution à l'étude du feu comme outil de gestion des aires protégées. Cas des feux
473 tardifs dans le Ranch de Gibier de Nazinga (Burkina Faso). Mémoire de DEA de l'Université
474 d'Orléans, France.
- 475 Zar JH (1999) Biostatistical Analysis, fourth edition. Prentice- Hall Inc., and Schuster, New Jersey.

476

477


478 Table 1. Synthesis of the density and population size estimates obtained by DISTANCE methodology on the
 479 bushbucks at the study area in southern Burkina Faso.


480

Parameter	Estimate
DISTANCE model	Hazard rate/Cosine
f (0)	0.0118
Var [f (0)]	0.02
Width of the W band (m)	85.011
density (D) of waterbucks per km ²	0.515
Variance of (D)	1.164
95% upper confidence limit	1.359
95% lower confidence limit	0.195
% Coefficient of Variation	51.60
Estimate of waterbuck population size	502
95% upper confidence limit	1325
95% lower confidence limit	190
χ^2	5.184
P	0.269
df	4
Number of individuals per group (range)	1-18
Density of groups per km ²	0.212
Mean number of individuals per group	4.12

481

Figure 1. Map of the study area, showing the seven zones in which, the protected area was divided.






487

488

489 Figure 3. Yearly trend (period 1085-2018) in the number of individuals of waterbucks at the study area in
490 southern Burkina



ONLINE SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

493

494 Table S1. Synthesis of the dataset collected on the tracks of illegal activities within the study area during 2019.


	number of cases
Poaching	42
Pastoralism	34
charcoal	18
tree cutting	22
human tracks	14
motor bike tracks	11
tree-branch thinning	5
Total	146

495

496

497


498 Figure S1. Frequency distribution of the various waterbuck groups in relation to the number of individuals in
499 each group.



500

501

502 Figure S2. Profile of the visibility curve for the waterbuck observations at the study area, during the year 2019




503

504

505 Figure S3. Spatial distribution of the tracks of illegal activity within the study area in the year 2019, in relation
506 to the group size of waterbucks.

507



508